



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

liminary stages there should be (as we have in this country) daily lessons. It properly explains that too wide an interval between lessons makes it inevitable that the impression of one lesson should be lost entirely before the next lesson is undertaken. It also tends to destroy interest by breaking continuity. A second foreign language should not be taken up for at least a year after the first foreign language has been begun and inasmuch as schools nowadays usually demand several foreign languages, the study of Latin should not be postponed beyond the age of eleven.

The recommendations with regard to the methods of teaching are those with which we have been familiar for a considerable time. The report emphasizes that unessentials should be removed from the first year—unfamiliar words, unfamiliar forms, unfamiliar constructions. For example *filibus* is of such rare occurrence that it should never be taught to first year students; so the accusative singular of words like *tussis*, *amussis*, Greek substantives, rare or non-existent comparatives, constructions like *non dubito quin*, etc. There is obviously a grievance in the English schools in regard to such matters which we have had either the good luck or the good judgment to avoid.

HOMER AND HIS AGE¹

The title of Mr. Lang's book is likely to raise false expectations. It is not, in spite of the preface, an attempt to reconstruct in imagination the age of Homer in all its social, political and institutional details. In reality, it is simply a continuation of his defence of Homer's unity with special reference to the archaeological side of the controversy.

The part actually devoted to the facts of Homeric life is found in chapters 4-10 and 12. It deals with (1) The feudalism of Homer; (2) Burial and Cremation; (3) Homeric Armor—Shields and Corselets; (4) The use of Bronze and Iron; (5) The Homeric House; and (6) Homeric Language.

His conclusion on these points are as follows:

(1) Homer describes an age of loose feudalism, in which Agamemnon is the overlord and the rest of the Achæan chieftains are the vassals.

(2) Cremation, with cairn-burial of the ashes, is the rule in Homer for gentle and simple alike; and this fact, together with the absence of the cult of the dead, points to a period intermediate between the Mycenaean times and the earliest post-Dorian graves.

(3) The shield of Homer is always the ἀμφιβρότη the man-enclosing shield, sometimes like the shield of Ajax, semi-cylindrical, sometimes of the double targe or figure 8 form. These shields did not impede rapid motion on foot.

(4) The Homeric warriors wore hauberks or corselets of linen or of bronze, which served as protection against a shower of arrows but were worthless against a powerful blow at close range.

(5) The weapons in Homer are uniformly of bronze. Iron is mentioned frequently, but as the metal of peaceful implements. The use of both, side by side, with this differentiation, may be accounted for by the fact that the working of iron was not completely understood and that therefore iron weapons were likely to be less effective than bronze.

(6) The Homeric house in both Iliad and Odyssey had upper chambers, a women's apartment and a separate chamber for the heads of the family.

So much for the constructive part of Mr. Lang's argument. If we turn to the preface and to the task he sets himself, certain things are quite apparent. His thesis is that "Homer depicts the life of a single brief age of culture". And here both qualifying adjectives are important. For while a single age would explain the unity of impression, the *unus color* on which he insists so often and so much, it would not at all establish unity of authorship. If the age is brief, however, diversity of authorship would amount almost to collaboration, and that is scarcely an admissible hypothesis. Now, all that Mr. Lang has stated would, if convincingly demonstrated, go a certain way toward fulfilling the first of the two adjectives, but throws no light on how long an age may have lasted of which the things stated were true.

Again, granted that it is a single brief age which we meet in Homer, there is the often-advanced possibility that, just as the poet or poets undoubtedly refer to a time prior to their own, so they give this time a background, not of their own age, but of a traditionally-remembered past. An essential element in establishing Mr. Lang's position is the refutation of this hypothesis. Indeed, there is a running attack throughout the whole book on precisely this view of Homer.

But are Mr. Lang's views beyond peradventure? In the first place, the omissions are as striking as the selections. In a discussion of Homer's age, it is reasonable to expect a somewhat extended reference to Homeric religion and superstitions, to Homeric geography, to Homeric law and institutions. Although Mr. Lang, at the beginning of chapter 4, says that he will speak of all these things, as a matter of fact, he does not. There is absolutely no systematic treatment of them, and only a few cursory and widely-scattered allusions. For all Mr. Lang tells us, a thorough examination of the matters mentioned will effectually destroy his edifice. While therefore, we may first, in lawyer's parlance, demur to Mr. Lang's case because of insufficiency of allegations, there are, besides, serious

¹ *Homer and his Age*. By Andrew Lang. London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co. (1906). Pp. xiv+336. \$3.00.

objections to the matter and form of what he does say.

Mr. Lang's first position is that Homer depicted an age of loose feudalism. But except for the statement to that effect at the beginning of chapter 4, and a similar assertion at the end of chapter 5, the rest of these two chapters is devoted to a delineation of the character of Agamemnon. The justification for this procedure is found in the fact that Agamemnon, depicted as a weak, violent, unjust and wavering man, is precisely the sort of characterization one would expect from a poet of a feudal time, in which jealousy of the overlord was the dominant note of political life. In the latter part of the book Mr. Lang seeks to conform this view by introducing as a parallel the character of Charlemagne in the later *chansons de geste* of the French Charlemagne cycle.

On the logic of this, it is scarcely necessary to waste many words. If that is Agamemnon's character, and if the parallel with Charlemagne is a close one, that might have some confirmatory force after the existence of a feudal régime had been made probable from other sources. Standing alone, it is practically valueless.

Mr. Lang next treats of the Homeric shield. His aim is to prove that Homer always speaks of the same shield. The two elements here are size and shape. Homer mentions tower-like shields and others, *πάντος ἑίσῃ*, equal in every direction. As for size, where that is specified, the shield is the *ἀμφιβρότη*; it covers the whole body. The epithet 'equal in all directions' is variously interpreted, now by 'circular', now by 'well-balanced'. Mr. Lang inclines to the belief that the shields were circular. For the possibility (which has been questioned) of a huge body-covering shield, circular in shape, he refers to the vase of Aristonothos, on which, it is urged, on one side of the contending galleys the warriors are portrayed with precisely such shields. But, in spite of Mr. Lang's confident assertion, it is at least open to question whether the shields there represented are really of this type. The drawing is not calculated to inspire confidence in the observing power or technical skill of Aristonothos. Helbig's objections, which Mr. Lang cavalierly dismisses, are after all not futile.

On the corselet, Mr. Lang has a deal to say. It is a current criticism that the corselet is a later invention, that its introduction in Homer proves the later origin of the poems, at least of the portions in which it is mentioned. Mr. Lang meets this criticism by laying stress on such permanent epithets as *χαλκοχιτώνες*, which he will not allow to refer to the shields, by citing the constant use of the plural *τεύχεα*, by emphasizing the weakness of the corselet except against missiles thrown from a distance, or sometimes against a spear of which the

force has been spent in piercing the shield. Because of this weakness, the absence of allusion to the corselet does not imply its absence when the course of a spear is described with Homeric fullness of detail, for it would go without saying to any hearer that the corselet would not resist a spear.

The distinction between iron and bronze Mr. Lang brings prominently forward. Throughout bronze is the metal of war. Iron is mentioned, first in its figurative sense, as symbolical of hardness (being interchangeable with bronze in that sense), and secondly, in its literal sense as the metal of household implements.

Now, iron is not found in the early Mycenaean tombs, and, in the latest tombs it is present only in the form of iron rings. Homer would then represent an age when iron was commoner than it was in Mycenae, and less common than in late Greece.

There are two references to iron as the metal of war in Homer. One is in *Iliad* 4. 123; here Pandarus draws the iron arrowhead to his bow. The other is in *Odyssey* 16, 294, 19. 13. Here two identical passages, of about nine lines, end with the statement, "for iron of itself draweth a man thereto." The contradiction between these passages and the ordinary condition of affairs in Homer Mr. Lang meets in two ways; the first, by silence; the second, by rather shamefacedly suggesting the possibility of interpolation.

That there is no inherent improbability in the use of iron for implements of peace, while weapons are still of bronze, Mr. Lang shows. It fits in well with his doctrine that Homer represents a transition from Mycenaean times to those of later Greece that this should be so. Conservatism is a powerful force in military matters, as it is elsewhere. Skill in the working of iron is necessarily a slowly acquired affair. The invading Gauls of the third century B. C. had swords of iron that bent at every stroke and had to be put into condition at once at imminent risk to the wielder. If the Homeric iron was no better than that, we can understand the preference for the older bronze. Mr. Lang cites the very instructive analogy that European armies retained the use of the cross-bow a considerable time after gunpowder was invented. Still it does not appear why such little eccentricities as bending or breaking at every stroke are not as objectionable in a knife as in a sword. There is also a psychological difficulty in the fact that, where there is so constant and clean-cut a differentiation between the actual uses of bronze and iron, the figurative sense of *σιδήρειος* and *χάλκειος* are not likely to have been perfectly identical. Again the normal interpretation of such a phrase as *σιδήρειος δρύμαγδος* implies the presence of iron weapons in the mind of the poet.

Conceding that everything that Mr. Lang contends for has been established, we note, first, as has been stated before, that he does not contend for enough. There is a great deal about the Homeric age of which he does not breathe a syllable. Again he does not fulfil the promise of his preface. It is not enough that the Homeric poems depict a single age. To point to unity of authorship, he must make the limits as narrow as possible, he must show it to have been very brief. That is quite as essential for his purpose, and of that, except for the preface, we hear practically nothing. How many generations the Greeks used the ἀμφιβόρη, the corselet of wretchedly bad bronze, how long cremation was their exclusive method of burial, are things that must be answered before uniformity of description can be taken to demonstrate unity of authorship.

As to placing the Homeric poems in time, Mr. Lang's arguments are equally inadequate. Granted the unity of the age, it is not sufficient to show the difference from Mycenae on the one hand and from Hellas on the other. What the transitional features of the age are, what elements are retained of the day that is going, and what foreshadowed of the day that is coming are not stated. The probability is always present that we are dealing with a special development under peculiar and somewhat exceptional conditions.

(To be concluded.)

NEWTOWN HIGH SCHOOL

MAX RADIN

REVIEWS

Incubation or The Cure of Disease in Pagan Temples and Christian Churches. By Mary Hamilton. London: W. C. Henderson & Son (1906). Pp. 223.

"The subject of Incubation", says Miss Hamilton in her Preface, "is of interest to modern readers for two reasons. In the first place, the practice—designated without ambiguity in German as 'Tempelschaf', i. e. Temple-sleep—is one which, in virtue of its origin, belongs to paganism, but is countenanced and encouraged in the twentieth century by two of the chief sections of the Christian church. And, secondly, it produces results which have much in common with hypnotic cures and the achievements of Christian Science. The aim of the present work is to give an historical sketch of the development of the practice of Incubation from the earliest times down to the present day".

The subject has been divided into three parts. In the first, the author treats of Incubation in Pagan Temples; Part Two deals with Incubation in Christian Churches during the Middle Ages; The Practice of Incubation during Modern Times occupies the concluding portion of the book. To students of the Classics, Part One is attractive; to

all who find acquaintance with the customs of modern Greece and Italy a constant inspiration, Part Three will be suggestive of the charm which Old World practices hold for the Occidental.

In the Introduction, Miss Hamilton refers to the "four working methods of divination", among which revelations of the future as deduced from dreams had the greatest vogue. "From Pharaoh's dream downwards there are recorded many illustrations of the importance with which they were regarded not only by the ignorant and superstitious, but by philosophical thinkers". Five books of Oneirocritica were written by Artemidoros of Ephesus, who divided dreams into five classes. The fifth class, *chrematismoi*, were most important for divination. Two other kinds of dreams are worthy of interpretation—the vision and the *somnium* or dream proper.

"Incubation was the method by which men sought to entice such dreams". The gods in whose temples this was practised were chthonian deities, who shared with the earth her power of sending dreams as well as her gifts of healing. Thus the temples of such gods became centers of medical divination obtained through incubation. While illness was the usual motive for consulting the gods, counsel might be sought in any difficulty. From writers of the classical period we learn that the god was often merely "a voice in a dream". If he appeared, it was abruptly, and his disappearance was likewise sudden. Traces of the beginnings of this practice may be found in Homer's description of the Selloi or Helloi, "the prophets of Zeus of Dodona, who sleep on the ground and wash not their feet". The first literary reference to incubation is in the Ploutos of Aristophanes.

As the temples of Asklepios were the chief centers of incubation, the author treats them in detail. Epidauros is the first considered. After a brief account of the origin and development of the Asklepios cult, the results of excavations there are described and the famous inscriptions which were found in the precinct are quoted. These inscriptions show some uniformity. Usually, during a night's sleep in the temple, the patient is visited by the god and cured by some simple surgical operation, or else by some act which stimulates the willpower. In Roman times, and perhaps earlier, medical science has advanced and temple-visitors follow out a definite course of treatment. The Sacred Orations of Aristides, written in the second century A. D., give a detailed account of an illness which lasted for seventeen years, but was finally cured by persistent regard for the directions of Asklepios as given in visions and dreams. The cult of Asklepios in Rome was established on the Tiber Island in 293 B. C. as a direct offshoot of that in Epidauros. The ex-votos indicate that its